

PROTECTING AMERICA'S NUCLEAR ENERGY SUPPLIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about a subject that is of great importance to those who are Members of this House, but also to every citizen in this country.

Some 2 years ago, a decision was made to privatize the uranium enrichment industry in this country. The individual who oversaw that privatization, Mr. Nick Timbers, as a government employee was compensated around \$350,000 per year. After privatization occurred, Mr. Timbers' salary went to approximately \$2.48 million a year. I think it was a terrible conflict of interest to allow an individual who was in a position to enrich himself to be involved in the decisions which led this industry from being privatized.

The results of privatization have been very, very grave to this country. The American citizen needs to know that approximately 23 percent of all of the electricity generated in this country is generated through nuclear power, and, as a result of decisions being made by this privatized company, we are in danger of losing the capacity to enrich uranium and to create the fuel necessary to produce 23 percent of our Nation's electricity.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is charged with doing an analysis, and they must do an analysis to determine whether or not this private company can be depended upon to continue to produce a reliable domestic supply of nuclear fuel needed to meet our Nation's needs. It has come to my attention that the staff of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has done their analysis and has taken that analysis to members of the commission, but they have been sent back to the drawing board, so-to-speak.

In the interim period, it has also come to my attention that the management of this new privatized corporation, and I have been told that specifically Mr. Timbers himself, is trying to interfere with the conclusions of the staff of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Put simply, this private company is now arguing that "domestic" does not include simply the material that is produced within the United States of America, but they are arguing that we should also include the material that is being imported from Russia as a part of the "domestic supply." They are also arguing that "reliable" does not mean the ability to produce 100 percent of our Nation's needs, but "reliable" could mean 60 percent or 50 percent or 40 percent of our Nation's needs.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that this Congress not allow this external influence to affect the conclusions

reached by the staff of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. It is important for us as a Congress and it is important for this administration to say very clearly that "domestic" means the material that is produced within the continental United States. We cannot depend upon Russia to meet our domestic needs.

We should also make it clear that when we talk about reliable, we mean 100 percent of our Nation's needs should be met, not 60 percent nor 40 percent.

These are esoteric matters, but they are important matters, because if this Congress does not take responsible action, and if this administration does not take responsible action, we could find ourselves in a relatively short period of time being dependent upon foreign sources, especially Russian sources, for the fuel that it takes to generate 23 percent of our Nation's electricity.

Mr. Speaker, we know what happens when we rely too heavily upon foreign sources for oil. Gasoline prices skyrocket. But this Congress now has an opportunity to prevent a calamity, to prevent a disaster from happening.

I am just beseeching my colleagues in this House to pay attention to this critical issue. Do not let this industry disintegrate. We must protect the enrichment industry in this country, we must protect the mining industry, we must protect the conversion industry in this country. If we do not, if we do not, in a few short years this country could find itself in an untenable situation where we must depend totally upon foreign sources for some 23 percent of our Nation's electricity. We cannot let that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I beg my colleagues, I beg my colleagues, to pay attention to this vital issue.

GETTING ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL OFF OF FOOD STAMPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I come back to the floor after several weeks of not being on the floor to talk about our men and women in uniform that are on food stamps.

This photograph is of a Marine that is getting ready to deploy for the Balkans. In his arms he has his daughter, Bridgett, and on his feet is a little 2-year-old girl named Megan.

Mr. Speaker, we have done a great deal to help our men and women in uniform in the 6 years I have been here in office as we have tried to increase their pay, to improve their quality of life, and we have made some great strides. But, Mr. Speaker, the problem is, we still have men and women in uniform that are on food stamps.

Mr. Speaker, I feel, as do most Members of this House, that anybody that is willing to die for this country when called upon to protect our freedoms, they should not be under any circumstances on food stamps.

I felt somewhat compelled after July 4th, being home, and, like most Members here, I went to several parades, and at a couple of these parades the Marine Band was there and the Honor Guard, and I saw those Marines in their dress blues, and it just reminded me, not just of Marines, but any man or woman in uniform, whether it be the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force or the Coast Guard, that we would have those in uniform that are on food stamps.

Here we are this week, again we will be debating another foreign operations bill, yet we find millions of dollars to send overseas. I know there is a need to have foreign aid, I am not saying that we should not be, but I think we do have an obligation to protect those in uniform first, those that are on food stamps. Quite frankly, I am quoting Daniel Webster who said, "God grants liberty to those who love it and are willing and prepared to defend it."

Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate to have the men and women in uniform that we have in the Armed Services of America, but, yet, again, I came to the floor because we have a bill that I introduced a year ago, H.R. 1055, that would help our men and women in uniform. I have over 100 signatures, Mr. Speaker, and that is both Republican and Democrat, and I continue to encourage my leadership, as I hope that Democrats who have signed this bill are encouraging their leadership, to say that we will not leave this year in October without helping those on food stamps, to do the very best to make sure that we have no one in uniform on food stamps. That might be somewhat idealistic, but I think it is worthy of our efforts to do that, to make sure that they are not on food stamps.

I want to share with you, because I have military bases, Camp Lejeune in Jacksonville, Cherry Point Marine Air Station in Havelock, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base in Goldsboro, and also a Coast Guard base in Elizabeth City.

Recently the Jacksonville paper, which is the home of Camp Lejeune, they did a feature on men and women in uniform that are at the bottom of the ladder, so-to-speak, as it speaks to their income, and this article said that there are 145 Marine families in Camp Lejeune, which again is in Jacksonville, that receive a total of \$25,000 a month in food stamps.

I ask this, Mr. Speaker, that if we have 145 that are identified that go to the social services for food stamps, how many do we have in that area that are not going because of pride or because of some other reason?

So, again, I am encouraging our leadership this year, Mr. Speaker, before

we leave in October, to please, let us work together in a bipartisan way to make sure that when we leave, that no one is dependent on food stamps in the military.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a poem that I think is very appropriate for all of us in the Congress, as well as anyone in this country that maybe has not served in the military, to remember that the freedoms that we enjoy are guaranteed by those in uniform.

The poem was written by Father Dennis O'Brien, United States Marine Corps.

"Who has given us freedom of the press?
It is the soldier, not the poet.
Who has given us freedom of speech?
It is the soldier, not the campus organizer.
Who has given us the freedom to demonstrate?
It is the soldier,
Who salutes the flag,
Who serves beneath the flag,
Whose coffin is draped by the flag,
Who allows the protester to burn the flag."

Mr. Speaker, I close with that, because, again, I want to remind the Members of the United States House of Representatives that we do have over 6,000 men and women in uniform which are on food stamps, and I would hope we would do everything possible to make sure when we leave again in October that we have very few in the military on food stamps.

□ 1800

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) switch places in the queue, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) has an important dinner this evening, if we might do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO RONALD LASCH, FAITHFUL SERVANT TO THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for arranging the switching of the order. It is very gracious of him.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of course will duly note whatever I say on the floor tonight, although perhaps few others will. But I feel compelled to

come to the floor and share with my colleagues a deep sense of loss that I feel and that I think most every Member of this body will feel that our friend and our very faithful colleague or servant, Ronald Lasch, has chosen to enter retirement.

Ron was a great friend of all of us in this body, a great helpmate to all of us in this body. There are few that I have served with or worked with as a Member of the Congress who have been more effective in allowing me to do my job better than I would otherwise have been able to do it than Ron Lasch.

I remember Ron Lasch also as someone who was an ad hoc, but very, very effective and important, staff person or advisor to the members of the North Atlantic Parliamentary Group who represent this country in the meetings of the North Atlantic Assembly of NATO. His advice, his wisdom, his breadth of knowledge on the issues that we were debating and discussing was always something that we could look to and learn from. He was, indeed, a remarkable part of how this institution works and works better; and he will be very definitely and sincerely missed by so many of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) for yielding to me. I came to the floor for another purpose. Not only did I not know that Ron Lasch was retiring, I did not know we were having this Special Order, and my friend from Michigan asked if I would like to insert my oars into these waters lauding Ron Lasch.

Mr. Speaker, some call him the floor manager, some call him the Great Poobah or the Great Mogul. Oftentimes, Mr. Speaker, I would go to Ron, I would come in here perhaps from a committee hearing and I would be running late and I would go to him and I would say Ron, what is this vote, my dear friend? And he would instinctively grab his wallet. When you are calling me "dear friend" you are up to no good. But I never saw him in any way become impatient with us, and that is the same, Mr. Speaker, for the staff generally.

Last month I was at an event in the intellectual property community in this town with ORRIN HATCH, Senator HATCH, the gentleman from the other body, from Utah. At that hearing I said to those people, oftentimes we take staff for granted. Mr. Speaker, we have talked about it before. Staff is very essential to the well being and to the efficient functioning of this body. Sometimes we think it does not function efficiently; but I think, on balance, it does, and Ron Lasch is the epitome of that role. I know he will be missed, as the gentleman from Virginia just said. He will be sorely missed here.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) for inviting me to share these few thoughts.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we are all delighted to be here and wish for Ron the very best in his retirement, but we want him to know how very much we will miss him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman's comments are well taken.

EFFORTS TO COMBAT ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House, for the first time ever, tackled the public health threat from antibiotic-resistant bacteria in our food supply.

On Monday, during debate on the agriculture appropriations bill, the House passed my amendment to dedicate an additional \$3 million to the work of the Food and Drug Administration on antibiotic resistance resulting from the use of antibiotics in livestock.

Scientists and public health officials have known for decades that using the same antibiotics for food animals as for people could cause problems. Sixteen years ago my esteemed colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), introduced legislation to curtail the use of human antibiotics in animals. But this amendment, Mr. Speaker, marks the first time this House has taken legislative action to stop antibiotic resistance from agricultural overuse of these precious drugs.

Mr. Speaker, we thought we were winning the war against infectious diseases. With the introduction of antibiotics in the 1940s, humans gained an overwhelming advantage in the fight against bacteria. But this war is far from won. Last month, the World Health Organization issued a ringing warning against antibiotic resistance. Around the world, microbes are mutating at an alarming rate into new strains that fail to respond to drugs.

The mapping of the human genome project has been lauded far and wide in the past several weeks. Indeed, mapping the genome is a triumph that will lead to many breakthroughs in health care. But in the meantime, we are slowly, and in some cases, rapidly losing our precious antibiotics and putting ourselves at risk for diseases that we thought we had licked: tuberculosis, typhoid, cholera, dysentery and on and on and on.

We need to develop new antibiotics, to be sure; but we cannot give up on the ones we have and the ones that have been effective for decades. By